

## VIRGINIA DEMOCRATS

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE RICHMOND CONVENTION YESTERDAY.

HALLIDAY NOMINATED FOR GOVERNOR ON THE SEVENTH BALLOT.—GEN. JAMES A. WALKER NOMINATED FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR BY ACCLAMATION.—A LITTLE OF MR. WALKER'S HISTORY—OTHER NOMINEES. By Telegram to THE REPUBLICAN.

RICHMOND, VA., Aug. 10. The convention met promptly at 9:30 this morning. A call of the members was made for the third ballot. Gen. Fishback and Wm. Terry having been dropped last night, the candidates were Mahone, Daniels, Halliday and Taliaferro.

THE THIRD BALLOT. The third ballot resulted as follows: Mahone, 476; Daniels, 438; Halliday, 338; Taliaferro, 172.

After the third ballot the classroom were all closed doors except for a consultation. This retirement was the signal for a grand

CHURCHING MATCH. Old Fayette McMillen danced in the arena, and after a preliminary dance on the stage, he began with resolutions 18 and 19, and ended with the history of Virginia and McMillen for sixty years.

Mr. Beall, from somewhere, came up blowing Mahone's trumpet and his own, in the hope that Mahone's friend would nominate him for Attorney General.

THE FOURTH BALLOT. Fourth Ballot.—Daniel, 602; Mahone, 469; Halliday, 353; Taliaferro, 185. Taliaferro had been dropped. A resolution was adopted requiring all nominations now to be made that the lowest candidate to be dropped on each succeeding ballot, and not to be re-nominated.

Gen. Taliaferro and Gen. Fishback were re-nominated. Four ballots will decide the nomination.

THE FIFTH BALLOT. 11th p. m.—Fifth Ballot.—Mahone, 453; Daniel, 612; Halliday, 364; Taliaferro, 141; Lee, 110. Lee has been dropped.

THE SIXTH BALLOT. Sixth Ballot.—Mahone, 467; Daniel, 448; Halliday, 344; Taliaferro, 138. Taliaferro dropped.

THE SEVENTH BALLOT. At 8:10 o'clock the seventh ballot resulted in the choice of Halliday, the vote being 502 to Daniel's 500.

At 8:20 p. m., after the nomination of Halliday, the convention adjourned till 8 p. m.

THE EIGHTH BALLOT. The convention met at 8:30 o'clock, and a telegram from Major Daniel was read to the effect that he stands by the nominee.

Next in order were the nominations for Lieutenant Governor. The candidates were Judge Watkins, William D. Greenberry, Col. Robert Preston, and Gen. Jas. A. Walker. The latter was elected by acclamation.

Gen. Jas. A. Walker, the nominee for Lieutenant Governor, is a well-known man in the State. He is a native Virginian, and has been a member of the Legislature for many years. He is a man of high character, and is well respected by his constituents.

When next the vote was taken, the President met, it was one of the most noisy fields of the Convention. The cheering was so loud that it was necessary to have the speakers heard by the aid of a megaphone.

When the State stood by her obligations, the Convention passed a resolution to the effect that the State should stand by her obligations, and that the Convention should stand by the State.

WHAT WE EAT AND DRINK ADULTERATED WITH POISON. A THOROUGH SYSTEM OF CHEMICAL INSPECTION. REPORTED—MORE IMPORTANT THAN CLEAR EVIDENCE OF DEATH.

A regular meeting of the Board of Health was held at their rooms last evening, present, Drs. Vordt, Bliss and Cox and Prof. Langston.

A communication was received from the property-holder of South Washington, stating that the water of the Potomac River was polluted by the discharge of sewage from the city, and that the water was unfit for drinking.

The Board of Health ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

The Board of Health also ordered that the water of the Potomac River be tested for impurities, and that the property-holder be notified to stop the discharge of sewage.

## A POLITICAL MURDER.

## THE UNITED STATES MARSHAL OF TEXAS ASSASSINATED.

BY FRANK BRITTON, ADJUTANT GENERAL OF THE STATE UNDER GOV. DAVIS.—A POLITICAL BLOOD DROUGHT.—THE CAUSE OF THE MURDER.—A REPLY FROM MARSHAL PURNELL TO THE CHARGES RECENTLY PRESENTED AGAINST HIM BY HIS MURDERER AND OTHERS. By Telegram to THE REPUBLICAN.

GALVESTON, TEXAS, Aug. 10. The New has a special dispatch from Austin, which says United States Marshal Purnell was shot twice by Frank Britton and probably fatally wounded. The accounts of the affair are conflicting. It is known that the two gentlemen belong to opposing factions in the Republican party, and have had differences as to the distribution of the Federal patronage in this State.

THE NEWS CONFIRMED. Special Dispatch to THE REPUBLICAN. AUSTIN, TEXAS, Aug. 10.—Britton shot Purnell. Supposed to be fatal. A cold-blooded murder.

THE MURDERED MAN AND HIS ASSASSIN. We have but very little data at hand concerning Marshal Purnell's history. He was originally from Indiana, and was a son-in-law of Bishop Ames. He was about forty-two years of age, and a man of fine physique. He stood very high at the Department of Justice, where he was regarded as a brave, intelligent, faithful and honest officer. In Texas, he was very popular among all classes. His assassin, Britton, was Adjutant General of the State, under Governor Davis, and is a young man about thirty years of age. When in Washington last month, he came to our office, and handed us a copy of the charges against Marshal Purnell, which he in company with Gov. Davis and others had presented to Attorney General Devens on the day of his visit here. Britton's appearance was not in his favor.

A LETTER FROM MARSHAL PURNELL TO THE REPUBLICAN. Almost simultaneously with the dispatch announcing the assassination of Marshal Purnell the mail brings us the following communication, which is a reply to the charges filed against him in the Department of Justice some time ago, and will be read with more ordinary interest in view of the writer's tragic end. It will be perceived that he makes reference to his murderer, whom he numbers among those who have for years followed him "with the bitterness of fiends."

AUSTIN, TEXAS, July 30, 1877. Editor National Republic, Washington, D. C.: I am in receipt of your paper, in which you publish a communication from the United States Marshal of Texas, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton. The communication refers to charges made two years ago, and another communication from the United States Marshal, signed by F. D. Britton.

## THE TELEGRAPH COMPANIES.

## MOVEMENTS FOR A CONSOLIDATION OF THE WESTERN UNION AND ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC.

NEW YORK, Aug. 10. For several days past there have been rumors that a consolidation would be brought about between the Western Union and Atlantic and Pacific Telegraph Companies. The report gained currency only because of the very rise in the Western Union, and the exposure of Gould's position in being long of the stock. It was conjectured that he would not have bought so enormously unless he had arranged to do away with the opposition by purchase or lease. Here, however, his position appeared strange; he had disposed of his Atlantic and Pacific stock, and after his success with the latter could not count upon their assistance. Besides, Keene was short of Western Union, and naturally would consent to nothing likely to advance the price.

It appears that while Sage and Keene hold the majority of Atlantic and Pacific stock, Jay Gould has a majority in the board of directors, and to a certain extent, he is the master of the situation. His object all along has been to get in first on Western Union, and then compel the Atlantic and Pacific to sell out on such terms as he shall dictate. When his trouble with Solover occurred, however, all chance of treating with Keene was out of the question, and it looked as if Keene would be brought to a dead-lock. Keene, finally, upon the earnest solicitation of Russell Sage, put his share of the 50,000 Atlantic and Pacific stock into the hands of the latter for safe keeping, and negotiations were opened.

Whether Mr. Sage has acted with the full consent of Mr. Keene is not known, but it is certain that the former has consented to enter into negotiations with Western Union, on condition that he is to let into the stock at reasonable figures.

The executive committee of each company is in treaty in regard to a consolidation or lease of the Atlantic and Pacific. Russell Sage is the real representative of the Atlantic and Pacific, and it is understood that Jay Gould stands in between him and Frank Work, who reports to the latter. So far, no definite proposition has been made, and it is uncertain whether Mr. Gould's scheme will be carried through.

NATURE'S FREAK. AN INFANT MINUS ARMS, WITH ONE SHORT LEG, AND LACKING A TOE—WHAT A REPORTER SAW.

St. Louis, Mo., Aug. 10. On Sunday evening last Mr. Michael Dooley, residing at 502 South Fourth street, gave birth to a female child which is an extraordinary instance of malformation, it being without arms and legs.

Yesterday afternoon a reporter of this paper made a call. In a room filled with old rubbish was a man washing a child with his knees.

"You're a reporter, I suppose?" he asked.

"And you've come to look at the little one?"

"Certainly not. I'm the father, Michael Dooley; and he added to a child in the room."

"What a monster that gentleman wishes to see the baby."

After waiting a moment or two outside to give the mother time to prepare the father and reporter went into the room.

The mother lay in bed in a naturally feeble condition. By the side stood a rocking chair, which was gently being swung to-and-fro by a young woman, who gently lifted up the wee baby and held it in her arms.

Mr. Dooley undid the swaddling clothes and showed that the little thing was utterly without arms. The right shoulder was perfectly straight with the trunk, without the slightest curve, and the left arm, which was a mere bone, was wanting. In the place of the left arm was a supple-like protuberance, the length of which was about the length of the arm, and is curved, and one toe is missing.

When the reporter left the room the mother was soothing her babe's cries in a low sort of wailing, pitiful crying, which was none the less a cry of pain, and the child was being held in a strong Irish brogue.

Michael Dooley, the father, stated that for the first two days the baby had tolerable health, but now it is subject to spasms.

Dooley is a slave and Irish, but has not worked for four months, except a day or two. He has four young children besides the new-comer. Evident as is the want of the arms and legs, the child is not, however, did not need that, however; the whole surrounding told the story.

NEW YORK NOTES. A BOY'S TERRIBLE FALL.—A COMMENTARY ON THE CONVENTION OF BANKERS.

NEW YORK, Aug. 10. The last call of the Cotton Exchange was suspended this afternoon, owing to a terrible accident which befell a boy named John McCarthy, said to be the nephew of Rev. Patrick McCarthy, who was buried yesterday. The boy fell from the top of the Cotton Exchange, and sustained a fracture of the skull, which caused death.

An appeal signed by Justus Schwab and Leonard C. Feltman, of Tompkins county, and other communists, has been issued, asking the citizens to subscribe for the benefit of 4,000 communists imprisoned in New Caledonia, who are described as "our brothers."

The annual convention of the bankers of the United States is announced to be held in this city on the 12th, 13th and 14th of September. In this convention will be represented the 9,152 banks of the country, of which 2,082 are national banks, and 7,070 are private banks, and 671 savings institutions.

SORE-HEAD OHIO REPUBLICANS. RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED YESTERDAY DENOUNCING THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY.

COLUMBIA, OHIO, Aug. 10. A meeting of anti-Administration Republicans held in this city last night, adopted resolutions bitterly denouncing President Hayes and his Southern policy, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

The meeting also adopted a resolution denouncing the policy of the Administration, and declaring that the Republican party in this State would not support the Administration.

## POLITICAL NEWS.

## AT THE EXECUTIVE MANSION AND THE DEPARTMENTS.

THE RICHMOND COLLECTOR. THE CHARGES AGAINST OTIS H. RUSSELL TO BE PRESENTED TO-DAY TO COMMISSIONER RAUM.—RUSSELL ACCUSED OF BEING A PARTY TO THE DEFAULCATION OF A FORMER COLLECTOR.

This is the day fixed by Commissioner Raum for the presentation of the charges in writing against Mr. Otis H. Russell, the present collector of internal revenue at Richmond. We learn that the following are among the principal charges that will be preferred:

1. That the said Otis H. Russell procured the retention of the bond given by him as collector as aforesaid, in consideration of a promise or agreement upon the part of said Russell to appoint to office under his control the friends and relatives of the said collector.

2. That the said Otis H. Russell falsely stated the delinquency of \$24,000 by Rush Rogers, the former collector of internal revenue at Richmond, for thirty days, when within the knowledge of said collector that the delinquency was not more than \$1,000, and that the said collector was not a party to the defalcation of a former collector.

3. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

4. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

5. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

6. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

7. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

8. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

9. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

10. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

11. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

12. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

13. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

14. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

15. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

16. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

17. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

18. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

19. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

20. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

21. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

22. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

23. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

24. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.

25. That the said Otis H. Russell was guilty of unlawful and irregular official conduct in permitting the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector, and in the retention of the bond given by him as collector.